

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-7513**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOSEPH ZIADEH,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 05-7571**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JOSEPH ZIADEH,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior  
District Judge. (CR-02-273)

---

Submitted: March 31, 2006

Decided: April 19, 2006

---

Before TRAXLER, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joseph Ziadeh, Appellant Pro Se. Gurney Wingate Grant, II, OFFICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Joseph Ziadeh, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000) motion and a subsequent order denying his motion for a certificate of appealability. An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Ziadeh has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Ziadeh's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED